



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,349	06/09/2006	Stefano Oggioni	FR920030077US1	5535
33074 7590 07/30/2008 INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION DEPT. 18G BLDG. 300-482 2070 ROUTE 52 HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533				
EXAMINER				
BARRY, ERIN P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1793				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,349

Applicant(s)

OGGIONI ET AL.

Examiner

ERIN P. BARRY

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/21/2008

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The term "passive stopper" in the claims are not used to describe the invention in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 12 and 13 recites the limitation "said liquid glue" in line 2 of the claims.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claims are dependent on claim 1 where there is no mention of "liquid" glue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10-11 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Desai et al. (5,170,931).

Regarding claims 1, 10 and 11, Desai et al. discloses a method for mounting a flexible film semiconductor chip on a substrate. Desai et al. discloses at least three pads 11,12 that are aligned forming more than three pairs. There are copper (electrically conductive) solder balls disposed between the pads (column 2 line 46-column 3 line 4 and figures 1a-1b).

Regarding claims 2, 15 and 16, Desai et al. discloses heating and melting the solder and then solidifying the solder at a cooler temperature (room temperature) (column 2 line 65 to column 3 line 4).

Regarding claim 4, Desai et al. discloses that the solder pads may be rectangular (column 8 lines 61-64).

Regarding claim 5, when the solder pads are rectangular as disclosed by Desai et al., the angle formed by the long edge of the solder pads would be 90 degrees.

Regarding claim 7, Desai et al. discloses that the corresponding bonding pads are matching (column 2 lines 46-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 6, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai et al. (5,170,931) as applied to claim 1.

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Desai et al. does not specifically disclose that at least one of the pairs of pads are a different size or annular shaped pads. However, Desai et al. does disclose that the bonding pads 11 may have virtually any desired size, and/or configuration, such as round, oblong, square rectangular, etc. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to use pads of desired shapes and sizes because Desai et al. states that it depends on the intended use of the application such as compatibility with the process of manufacturing and spacers (column 8 line 61- column 9 line 10).

Regarding claims 12-13, Desai et al. does not disclose the volume of the glue being used to bond the two parts together. However, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a predetermined volume of glue (solder balls) to ensure a desired bond of the two parts with out causing the solder to flow off the pads during heating.

7. Claims 8-9 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai et al. (5,170,931) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hauer et al. (6,125,043).

Regarding claim 8, Desai et al. does not disclose a passive stopper. However, Hauer et al. does disclose a passive stopper/stand-offs 20 for accurately positioning components on a circuit board. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to have stoppers because Hauer et al. states that the

stoppers/standoffs 20 determine the vertical position of the components (column 4 lines 31-64 and figure 3).

Regarding claim 9, Desai et al. and Hauer et al. do not disclose three non-colinear passive stoppers. However, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a desired amount or stoppers on the part during bonding to create an even vertical position based on the locations of the solder balls/glue because of the pulling force created by shrinkage during cooling of the solder (Hauer et al., column 4 lines 50-53).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai et al. (5,170,931) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nishikawa et al. (PCT/JP01/05050 with translation from US 2003/0092326).

Regarding claim 14, Desai et al. does not disclose applying a mechanical force on the first and second parts where the force is orthogonal to the pads. However, Nishikawa et al. does disclose thermocompression bonding of electronic components with pads 2,4 and solder 2 (figure 1c). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to use thermocompression bonding to apply a force that is orthogonal to the pads because Nishikawa et al. states that the compression keeps the circuit formation article in mutual electrical contact during bonding (paragraph 0009).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIN P. BARRY whose telephone number is (571)270-3634. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8am-5pm Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Ward can be reached on (571) 272-1223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/E. P. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 1793
7/24/2008

/Jessica L. Ward/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793